

## **REMARKS**

This paper is filed in response to the office action dated June 15, 2010, in the above-referenced application. This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for extension of time and authorization to charge our credit card account in the amount of the requisite fee. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 29610/CDT480.

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By the foregoing, claims 1 and 4 have been amended, and claims 2, 3, 9, and 15-17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, for example, in original claims 2 and 3, Figure 4, and page 13, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph after Table 1 (referring to the clean substitute specification filed July 28, 2006). No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a, e) as assertedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,693,296 to Tyan (“Tyan”).

Claims 1 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as assertedly anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. JP2000029404 to Ishizaki et al. (“Ishizaki”).

Claims 1-14 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,107,734 to Tanaka et al. (“Tanaka”) alone.

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly obvious over Ishizaki alone.

The examiner also objected to the drawings for allegedly failing to show the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 8. Specifically, the examiner indicated that the drawings must illustrate a plurality of pixels each comprising at least two sub-pixels of different types and corresponding transistors. In response, the examiner is respectfully directed to Figures 4 and 6 which depict the claimed subject matter as required. Removal of the objection to the drawings is therefore respectfully requested.

Additionally, the title has been objected to as not being sufficiently descriptive. The objection to the title should be withdrawn in view of the amendment to the title herein.

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

#### *Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102*

Claim 1 has been rejected as assertedly anticipated by Tyan. Claims 1 and 15 have been rejected as assertedly anticipated by Ishizaki. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as applied to pending claim 1 (as claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer).

Neither Tyan nor Ishikazi discloses an organic light emitting diode (OLED) display device, the display device having a plurality of pixels each comprising at least two sub-pixels of different types, a first sub-pixel type comprising an OLED device including a first type of OLED material and a second sub-pixel type comprising an OLED device including a second type of OLED material, wherein the OLED device including said first type of OLED material has a lower drive voltage than the OLED device including said second type of OLED material and a said pixel has a common power supply line for supplying power to said at least two sub-pixels, and wherein the first and second sub-pixel types comprise different number of series connected devices. Withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1 as anticipated is therefore respectfully requested.

#### *Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-14 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,107,734 to Tanaka et al. (“Tanaka”) alone. Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly obvious over Ishizaki alone. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as applied to pending claims 1, 4-8, and 10-14 (as the other claims have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer).

Tanaka fails to disclose pixels comprising different types of sub-pixels comprising different materials having different drive voltages. Column 6, lines 42-47 of Tanaka does not disclose or even contemplate pixels comprising different types of

sub-pixels as claimed. Moreover, it is submitted that if a person skilled in the art were to consider modifying the device of Tanaka by using different materials having different drive voltages, he or she would not attempt to use an arrangement having a common power supply line for supplying power to said at least two sub-pixels, as this would be expected to reduce efficiency and device lifetime. *See* the present application, for example, at page 5, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph.

Still further, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Tanaka to use series connected devices, much less different numbers of series connected devices for different types of sub-pixels (such as different colored sub-pixels). Connecting the OLED devices of the two types of sub-pixels in series allows the drive voltages of the OLEDs of the sub-pixels to be better balanced, thus reducing losses in the driver for the pixel taken as a whole. *See* the present application, for example, at page 7, 3<sup>rd</sup> full paragraph. To the extent the examiner chooses to maintain the assertion at page 6 of the action that “Tanaka discloses at least in fig. 1 at least said first type of sub-pixel comprises series connected devices,” further explanation is respectfully requested as the light emitting elements 6 in Figure 1 of Tanaka are not arranged in series.

Because there is no disclosure or suggestion in Tanaka (or any other cited document) that sub-pixels of a different type having a different drive voltage should be used, much less that a common power supply line for supplying power should be used in combination with different numbers of sub-pixels of different types in series in order to balance the drive voltage, the outstanding claim rejections should be reversed.

Finally, to the extent the Office intends to rely on Official Notice (*see* at least pages 6 and 7 of the outstanding action), the applicant respectfully requests that any rejections based on Official Notice be supported with documentary evidence. In this respect, the applicant respectfully submits that it is never appropriate to rely solely on common knowledge in the art as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based without evidentiary support in the record. *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379, 1385, (Fed. Cir 2001); *see also* MPEP §2144.03 (A).

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, the examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

December 15, 2010

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

/Andrew M. Lawrence/

Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130  
Attorney for Applicant  
6300 Willis Tower  
233 S. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300